

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims have been presented in a form believed to be more preferred by the Examiner. In response to the provisional restriction requirement, the Applicant will consider submitting a terminal disclaimer when the Examiner finds that the present application recites allowable subject matter.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 24-27 and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 5,907,707 (*Ramalingam et al.*). The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-6, 11-16, 18, 20-23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,907,707 (*Ramalingam et al.*). This rejection is respectfully traversed below for at least the following reasons:


Ramalingam et al. teaches utilizing three data structures (object data, class descriptor, and interface reference) arranged as an efficient mechanism for locating the appropriate method. As noted in *Ramalingam et al.*, "an efficient mechanism for method invocation is provided by generating an index that identifies the entry corresponding to the appropriate method in the interface method table pointed to by the first pointer of the interface" (*Ramalingam et al.*, col 4, lines 48-54). It is noted that the appropriate method can be located using the mechanisms described by *Ramalingam et al.* However, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention collects information about dispatched messages, thereby, among other things, allowing the collected information to be utilized to minimize the number of times the appropriate method needs to be located.

More particularly, it is respectfully submitted that *Ramalingam et al.* does not teach or suggest collecting information while the object-oriented program is being interpreted. Claims 1 is directed to a method for handling message dispatching in an object-oriented program, and among other things, it recites this feature. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over *Ramalingam et al.* for this reason alone. In addition, claims that are dependent on claim 1 are also patentable over *Ramalingam et al.* for at least this reason. Moreover, these dependent claims recite features that render them patentable for additional reasons. Other independent claims recite similar features and are patentable.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P146C1). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian
Reg. No.44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300